

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/625,700

Applicant(s)

TAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas Augustine

Art Unit

2179

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas Augustine.

(3) _____.

(2) Robert Jackson.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Girgensohn.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented to the Examiner proposed amendments to overcome the prior art rejection in the non-final office action mailed 08/22/2007. Proposed Amendments included "a designation section for accepting, during the reproduction of the video data, an instruction from a user to designate one of the plural pieces of still picture data displayed on the screen; and a correlation section for, upon the instruction entered by the user during the reproduction of the video data, correlating the designated one of the plural pieces of still picture data with reproduction time position in the video data". The applicant pointed out the direct support in the specification to support the amendments and stated that the proposed amendments might overcome the prior art relied upon in the previous office action. The Examiner notes that the discussion of the prior art rejection along with the proposed amendments might overcome the previous art rejection and will require further consideration and an updated search before making a final determination on allowability..